

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00111 171021Z

13

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 /026 W
----- 121393

P 170840Z APR 76

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3030

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 0111

EXDIS

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: HIGHLIGHTS: POST-PLenary DISCUSSIONS, APRIL 14, 1976
(SALT TWO-979)

1. (EARLE-SCHNEITER/SHCHUKIN, A-1270)

A. "TYPE" RULES

SHCHUKIN SAID HE WANTED TO DISCUSS THE PROBLEMS THE SOVIET
SIDE HAD WITH THE WORD "TYPE." HE SAID THAT POSSIBLY RATHER THAN
SPEAKING OF LAUNCHERS OF A "TYPE" WE SHOULD TALK ABOUT LAUNCHERS
WHICH WERE THE "SAME."

SHCHUKIN SAID THAT THE HEAVY BOMBER DEFINITION PROVIDED AN
EXAMPLE OF THE PROBLEM. "TYPE" WAS MORE INCLUSIVE THAN
"SAME." FOR EXAMPLE, THE B-52 MODEL A AND THE B-52 MODEL G
WERE OF THE SAME TYPE, EVEN THOUGH THEY LOOKED AND ACTUALLY
WERE DIFFERENT. FURTHER, THE U.S. WAS ATTEMPTING TO CONSIDER AS HEAVY
BOMBERS BOTH THE MYASISHCHEV BOMBER AND TANKER ON THE BASIS THAT
THEY WERE THE SAME TYPE OF AIRCRAFT. IN THE RUSSIAN MEANING OF THE
WORD, MINUTEMAN II AND MINUTEMAN III SILOS ARE OF THE SAME "TYPE."
SHCHUKIN WENT ON TO SAY THAT THIS WAS TRUE, BY SOVIET UNDERSTANDING,
BECAUSE THE SILOS HAD THE SAME DIMENSIONS AND TECHNICAL CHARAC-
TERISTICS. HOWEVER, WHILE HE THEN REPEATED THAT HE UNDERSTOOD
MINUTEMAN II AND MINUTEMAN III SILOS TO BE OF THE SAME "TYPE", HE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00111 171021Z

ALSO KNEW THAT A MINUTEMAN II SILO WAS NOT THE "SAME" AS A

MINUTEMAN III SILO.

B. DATA BASE

SHCHUKIN SAID HE QUESTIONED THE LEGAL BASIS FOR AGREEMENT AT THE TIME OF SIGNATURE ON NUMBERS BY CATEGORIES OF THE ARMS TO BE LIMITED BY THE NEW AGREEMENT.

EARLE SAID THAT HE THOUGHT THAT THIS TYPE OF PRIOR AGREEMENT WAS FAIRLY COMMON IN U.S. LEGAL PRACTICE. HE CITED AS AN EXAMPLE THE SALE OF A FACTORY WHERE THE SELLER MAKES A REPRESENTATION AS TO WHAT EQUIPMENT IS IN THE FACTORY. THIS IS DONE SO THAT IT IS CLEAR TO THE BUYER, BEFORE THE SALE IS FINALIZED, EXACTLY WHAT HE IS BUYING. THE U.S. PROPOSAL FOR AGREEMENT ON NUMBERS WAS SIMILARLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF MINIMIZING AMBIGUITIES AND DISAGREEMENTS WHICH COULD ARISE AFTER THE AGREEMENT WAS SIGNED. IF, FOR EXAMPLE, THE U.S. VIEW AS TO THE NUMBERS OF ARMS THAT A SIDE HAD IN EXCESS OF THE 2,400 LIMITATION WAS DIFFERENT FROM THE SOVIET VIEW, THIS COULD CAUSE PROBLEMS.

SHCHUKIN WONDERED WHETHER SUCH A PROPOSITION MEANT DELAYING THE SIGNATURE OF THE AGREEMENT BECAUSE THE SIDES MUST FIRST DISCUSS THE NUMBERS. EARLE SAID THAT THE U.S. WAS NOT PUSHING OFF SIGNATURE OF THE AGREEMENT. UNDER THE U.S. PROPOSAL, IT WAS ENVISIONED THAT THE AGREEMENT ON NUMBERS WOULD BE REACHED BY A CONTEMPORANEOUS PROCESS, WHILE THE CURRENT ENGOTIATIONS WERE GOING ON. THE U.S. THOUGHT IT WISE TO ENSURE THAT THERE WAS NO DISAGREEMENT ON THE TWO SIDES' UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE NUMBERS OF SYSTEMS TO BE DISMANTLED OR DESTROYED. SAID ANOTHER WAY, THE U.S. WANTED TO ENSURE THAT THERE WOULD BE UNIFORM APPLICATION OF THE AGREEMENT. NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS CAN ONLY DETERMINE THE FACTS. WE ALSO SHOULD CLEARLY AGREE ON HOW TO APPLY THE PROVISIONS TO THOSE FACTS.

2. (ROWNY/TRUSOV-BELETISKY, A-1271)

A. MIRV VERIFICATION

IN RESPONSE TO GENERAL TRUSOV'S QUERRY AS TO WHETHER ROWNY HAD ANY COMMENTS ON MINISTER SEMENOV'S STATEMENT, ROWNY SAID
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 00111 171021Z

IT SEEMED THAT THE SIDES WERE MOVING CLOSER TOGETHER IN ACCEPTING THAT THE ISSUE OF CONVERSION HAD TO BE DEALT WITH.

B. THROW-WEIGHT DEFINITION

IN DISCUSSING VARIOUS ELEMENTS WHICH MAKE UP THROW-WEIGHT, ROWNY, (THINKING OF THE SS-16) ASKED TRUSOV SPECIFICALLY WHETHER THEIR DRAFTERS WERE COGNIZANT THAT ONE OF THE SOVIET MISSILES CON-

TAINED A POST-BOOST VEHICLE AND A SINGLE REENTRY VEHICLE. TRUSOV WAS NON-COMMITTAL, ANSWERING THAT SUCH A CONFIGURED MISSILE HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THE DEFINITION OF THROW-WEIGHT. HE SAID THAT IT HAD BEEN AGREED IN MOSCOW TO INTRODUCE THE DEFINITIONS OF THROW-WEIGHT AND LAUNCH-WEIGHT ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE DIVIDING LINE BETWEEN THE HEAVY AND THE HEAVIEST LIGHT MISSILES. HE SAID THAT THE SOVIETS HAD NO INTENTION OF APPLYING THE CONCEPT OF THROW-WEIGHT TO THE "ENTIRE GAMUT OF MISSILES."

TRUSOV SAID THAT IN PREVIOUS CONVERSATIONS THE CONCEPT OF A BUS WAS UNSED ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF DISPENSING MORE THAN ONE REENTRY VEHICLE. ROWNY SAID THAT WE HAD MOVED AWAY FROM THE TERM "BUS" BECAUSE THE SOVIET SIDE FELT IT WAS JARGON. ROWNY SAID THAT IN SEARCHING FOR ANOTHER WORD WE HAD INTRODUCED THE TERM "POST-BOOST VEHICLE" SINCE IT WAS DESCRIPTIVE OF THE FUNCTION IT PERFORMS. TRUSOV SAID THAT THEIR WORD FOR P.B.V., "AVTONOMNII BLOK RAZVEDANII" (ABR), WAS USED ONLY IN CONJUNCTION WITH DISPENSING MORE THAN ONE REENTRY VEHICLE. IN RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION OF WHAT TERM THEY USE FOR THE DEVISE WHICH CORRESPONDS TO OUR USE OF THE POST-BOOST VEHICLE IN CONJUNCTION WITH A SINGLE REENTRY VEHICLE, TRUSOV CLAIMED NOT TO KNOW OF ANY SUCH SYSTEM AND REVERTED TO HIS ARGUMENT THAT IT HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THE ISSUE AT HAND. HE REPEATED THE AGRUMENT THAT THROW-WEIGHT WAS TO BE USED ONLY TO DIVIDE THE HEAVY FROM NON-HEAVY MISSILES. JOHNSON

NOTE BY OCT:"RAISED TO EXDIS PER SSO MEMO 7/29/71"

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: SALT (ARMS CONTROL), MEETING REPORTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 17 APR 1976
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: ShawDG
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976SALTT00111
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760146-0852
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760450/aaaabqdf.tel
Line Count: 141
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ShawDG
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 05 MAY 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <05 MAY 2004 by CollinP0>; APPROVED <02 SEP 2004 by ShawDG>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: HIGHLIGHTS: POST-PLENARY DISCUSSIONS, APRIL 14, 1976 (SALT TWO-979)
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006